

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-44 were pending in the present application before this amendment as set forth above. By this Amendment, claims 1-44 are amended.

In the February 6, 2007 Office Action, claims 5-24 and 29-44 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim may not depend from another multiple dependent claim. Claims 1-4 and 25-28 were objected to because of the informalities. Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Moreover, the abstract of the present application was objected to because it contained legal phraseology which should be reserved for the claims. Additionally, the Examiner also suggested adding proper subtitles to corresponding sections of the specification.

However, the Examiner indicated that “[c]laims 1-4 and 25-28 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph.”

Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s careful review of the application and indication of allowability of claims 1-4 and 25-28.

In response, as set forth above, claims 1-44 have been amended in better form. Specifically, claims 1-4 and 25-28 have been amended to correct typos and informalities, as suggested by Examiner. As amended, claims 1-4 and 25-28 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection to claims 1-4 and 25-28 is now overcome. Accordingly, amended claims 1-4 and 25-25 are allowable, as indicated by the Examiner.

Additionally, each of multiple dependent claims 5-24 and 29-44 has been amended to specifically depend from a single claim of now allowable amended claims 1-4 and 25-28. These claims have further been amended to correct typos and informalities. Therefore, the 37 CFR 1.75(c) objection to claims 5-24 and 29-44 is now overcome. Accordingly, amended claims 5-24 and 29-44 are also allowable at least for this reason.

Moreover, the specification and abstract have been amended for a better form so that the amended claims, the written description, abstract and the drawings are consistent with each other. Specifically, proper subtitles have been added into corresponding sections of the specification, as suggested by the Examiner. The abstract has been amended to delete legal phraseology which should be reserved for the claims. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the objection to the abstract is overcome.

Support for the amendment set forth above can be found in the disclosure as originally filed. Thus, applicant asserts that no new matter is added.

Any amendments to the claims not specifically referred to herein as being included for the purpose of distinguishing the claims from cited references are included for the purpose of clarification, consistence and/or grammatical correction only.


It is now believed that the application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 404.495.3678.

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP

April 6, 2007



Tim Tingkang Xia
Attorney for Applicants on the Record
Reg. No. 45,242

MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP
1600 Atlanta Financial Center
3343 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30326-1044
Phone: 404-233-7000
Direct: 404-495-3678
Customer No. 24728